

AD-A264 236



2

STUDY
PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

RESOURCING THE RELIGIOUS MISSION
OF THE ARMY TO THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND:
SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS AND ISSUES

BY

CHAPLAIN (LIEUTENANT COLONEL) DONALD G. HANCHETT
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

DTIC
ELECTE
MAY 14 1993
S E D

USAWC CLASS OF 1993



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

93-10057



REF ID: A264 236
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
DOWNTOWN, D.C. 20540

008

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17013-5050			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO	TASK NO
					WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Resourcing the Religious Mission of the Army to the Year 2000 and Beyond: Significant Concerns and Issues					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Chaplain (LTC) Donald G. Hanchett					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final MSP		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 93/04/15	
				15. PAGE COUNT 47	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP			
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Resourcing the religious mission of the Army has always been a matter of concern for Commanders and chaplains. There are constitutionality issues involving "free exercise of religion" and "establishment of religion" concerns that must be taken into consideration. Today, there are in excess of 1,200 religious bodies in the United States. Over 200 of these denominations are recognized by the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, and may have chaplains in the military. At the present time, the Army Chaplaincy has representation from some 142 of these distinctive faith groups. In order to meet the many diverse faith requirements and the individual spiritual needs of soldiers and family members, commanders and chaplains must be creative and intentional in the religious programs and activities they provide. As the Army attempts to satisfy the "free exercise" requirements inherent in it's religious mission, care must be taken to avoid religious discrimination and/or any effort to reduce morals, values, sacraments, ordinances, and religious ministrations to "commodities" for the mere convenience of funding or satisfying an accounting process. Failure on the part of chaplains and (see reverse)					
20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Chaplain (COL) Thomas Norton, Project Adviser			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (717) 245-3479		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ANCAA

Continued from Item 19. Abstract

Commanders to properly resource the religious mission will result in soldiers and family members having to "pay to pray." This is unacceptable. This study examines resourcing concerns and issues past, present, and future that impact the religious mission of the Army. It is an attempt to help commanders, chaplains, and policy makers to consider requirements, opportunities, and limitations related to resourcing the Army's religious mission to the Year 2000 and beyond.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**RESOURCING THE RELIGIOUS MISSION OF THE ARMY
TO THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND: SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS AND ISSUES**

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Chaplain (Lieutenant Colonel) Donald G. Hanchett
United States Army

Chaplain (Colonel) Thomas H. Norton
Project Adviser

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public
release; distribution is unlimited.**

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Donald G. Hanchett, Chaplain (LTC), USA

TITLE: Resourcing the Religious Mission of the Army to the Year 2000 and Beyond: Significant Concerns and Issues

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 15 April 1993 PAGES: 47 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Resourcing the religious mission of the Army has always been a matter of concern for commanders and chaplains. There are Constitutionality issues involving "free exercise of religion" and "establishment of religion" concerns that must be taken into consideration. Today, there are in excess of 1,200 religious bodies in the United States. Over 200 of these denominations are recognized by the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, and may have chaplains in the military. At the present time, the Army Chaplaincy has representation from some 142 of these distinctive faith groups. In order to meet the many diverse faith requirements and the individual spiritual needs of soldiers and family members, commanders and chaplains must be creative and intentional in the religious programs and activities they provide. As the Army attempts to satisfy the "free exercise" requirements inherent in it's religious mission, care must be taken to avoid religious discrimination and/or any effort to reduce morals, values, sacraments, ordinances, and religious ministrations to "commodities" for the mere convenience of funding or satisfying an accounting process. Failure on the part of chaplains and commanders to properly resource the religious mission will result in soldiers and family members having to "pay to pray." This is unacceptable. This study examines resourcing concerns and issues past, present, and future that impact the religious mission of the Army. It is an attempt to help commanders, chaplains, and policy makers to consider requirements, opportunities, and limitations related to resourcing the Army's Religious Mission to the year 2000 and beyond.

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special

INTRODUCTION

The need to insure proper resourcing of the religious mission of the United States Army to the year 2000 and beyond, is a matter of great concern for commanders and chaplains. The purpose of this paper is to consider major issues that must be addressed in resourcing the Army's religious mission during these times of turbulence and mandatory Defense cuts in personnel and spending. This study will briefly review who has responsibility for the religious mission; how it has been resourced in the past; sources of funding and support; concerns related to the proposal to fund the entire religious mission of the Army under the Defense Business Operations Fund (DBOF); essential requirements to ensure the "free exercise" of religion; and finally the Commander's Master Religious Program and recommendations for resourcing the Army's religious mission while improving efficiency and limiting costs.

BACKGROUND: RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE RELIGIOUS MISSION

Commanders have the responsibility to provide soldiers an opportunity for "free exercise of religion." This is prescribed by law and regulation.¹ Where assigned, chaplains assist the commander by performing duties and providing religious training, programs, and services to help meet the spiritual needs of soldiers and their family members. In this regard, it is important to note that chaplains are required to conduct

religious activities, services, sacraments, and ordinances consistent with the tenets of their individual faith groups. When the performance of such services and activities is contrary to the chaplain's faith commitment and ecclesiastical endorsement, the chaplain is responsible to make every effort to provide reasonable alternatives to meet the religious needs of soldiers and their families.²

BACKGROUND: RESOURCING THE RELIGIOUS MISSION

In addition to having primary responsibility for the Army's religious mission, commanders have responsibility to furnish chaplains with the fiscal resources needed to perform their duties in support of this vital mission. For example, Title 10 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) obligates the commanding officer to furnish facilities and transportation, to assist a chaplain in performing his/her duties.³ In providing our armed forces with a military chaplaincy, Congress has continued a commitment that began during the Revolutionary days before the adoption of the Constitution, and has continued ever since. When the Continental Army was formed, those chaplains attached to the militia of the 13 colonies became part of our country's first national army.⁴ It has always been the intent of Congress that the military's religious mission be resourced by the commander using appropriated dollars. In other words, it has been the intent of Congress to insure that soldiers not be required to "pay to pray."

APPROPRIATED FUNDING SOURCES:

During the past twenty years, there have been two primary sources of Appropriated Funding (APF) used to resource the Army's religious mission. Initially, G-1000 Funds were used. These dollars were programmed and budgeted in support of the Army's religious mission. The Office of the Chief of Chaplains (OCCH), at Department of the Army level, could account for the disbursement and utilization of these funds down to installation level. In more recent years, the Base Operations (BASOPS) .N0000 Account has been the primary source of appropriated funding for the religious mission. Relatively limited funds from Program 2 (General Purpose Forces), Program 8 (Training, Medical, and Other General Personnel Activities), and Program 9 (Administration and Associated Activities) sources have been made available to chaplains at the unit level.⁵ This decentralized resourcing support placed the primary responsibility for resourcing the religious mission on the Installation Commander and Chaplain. It required chaplains to compete for BASOPS dollars with such activities as Public Affairs, Safety, Equal Opportunity, the Inspector General, Staff Judge Advocate, and eight to ten other activities. Once this occurred, fair and equitable distribution of appropriated resources in support of the religious mission wavered. While many commanders and chaplains have maintained appropriate levels of religious support, there has been an increase in instances where appropriated fund support for the religious mission of a unit or installation has fallen below

adequate levels to sustain viable religious programs and activities.⁶ A recent example of this occurred just prior to Desert Shield/Desert Storm. One of the largest installations in the Army submitted the entire religious program for the Post as an unfinanced requirement (UFR). The rationale for this decision was that the MACOM Commander had mandated a certain level of training and readiness which required additional resources. Therefore, in order to meet the requirement, the local commander determined he would cut funding for the religious mission along with several other activities on the installation. When the unit was alerted for Desert Shield, religious supplies to include Bibles and elements for sacraments were drawn from garrison chapel programs at other installations.

CURRENT ISSUES AND CONCERNS RELATED TO BASOPS FUNDING:

Once placed under the BASOPS Account, the Chief of Chaplains was not able to identify or track specific dollars programmed in support of the Army's religious mission during the year of execution. For a period of time, it was only at the end of each fiscal year that the Chief of Chaplains could determine the actual dollars spent in support of religion. In order to determine the actual expenditures, the Office of the Chief of Chaplains (OCCH) was required to go through a lengthy process of tallying year end obligation reports from the field. In the last several years, even this capability was lost, when the religious mission was moved into the BASOPS .NB000 Account. Presently, there is no way to document what the Army is actually paying for

religious support. As long as such costs remain hidden, chaplain sponsored programs often become the "bill payer" for other programs. This happens when budget cuts are directed in the BASOPS .N0000 account. It is important to note that 90% to 95% of the appropriated fund support for a typical installation's religious program is funded from this account. On the other hand, most of the other activities in the BASOPS .N0000 Account have additional appropriated fund support from other appropriated sources. They may draw only 40-80% of their funding from BASOPS. Typically, cuts are implemented by doing what is referred to as a "salami slice." This means that when the .N0000 account is given a directed cut or reduction of 40% in funding, the fund manager passes that cut on "equally" to each account holder. In the case of the BASOPS .N0000 account, this would mean that the Religious Program, Public Affairs, Safety, the Inspector General, Staff Judge Advocate, Equal Opportunity and others would each be given funding cuts of 40% across the board. What "appears" on the surface to be an "equal" cut in resources, is in fact just the opposite. Obviously, 40% of 95% (the chaplain's total appropriated budget) is much greater than 40% of 70% (another activities partial appropriated budget). This problem is fast becoming a major threat to the viability and quality of religious support throughout the Army. Without adequate resourcing, commanders and chaplains cannot meet the spiritual needs of soldiers and family members. For this reason, the Chief of Chaplains has directed his staff to study and recommend possible

alternative funding sources and procedures. Such recommendations and studies have included the possibility of giving the religious mission it's own "lettered account" in BASOPS, or to provide the Chief of Chaplains with a Management Decision Package (MDEP) to fund religious programs, activities and ministry Army-wide down to installation level. All religious programs and activities at unit level that are in direct support of mission requirements would then be funded with "mission dollars" from the unit commander.

RELIGIOUS FACILITIES/ MCA PROJECTS

Religious facilities which include chapels, religious education centers and family life centers are resourced as part of the formal Military Construction (MCA) process.⁷ These projects compete with other military construction requirements based on availability of funding and local command priority considerations. For a significant number of years, construction projects in support of the Army's religious mission lagged significantly behind other military construction. It is interesting to note that the Army Chaplaincy was one of the first activities to come on-line with Standardized Construction Designs for religious facilities.⁸ They became the "vanguard" and model for the rest of the Army's facility standardization design program. From 1988 through 1992, Congress, the Chief of Staff of the Army (CSA), and the Deputy Chief of Staff Engineers (DCSENG) continued to push appropriated dollars to installations in

support of all MCA projects to include religious facilities. In addition, funds were set aside at Department of the Army level by the Assistant Chief of Engineers (ACE) to support what became known as "Chapel of the Year (COTY)" projects. The intent of this program was to provide emphasis and assistance in support of critical construction requirements for two religious facilities Army-wide per year. As an incentive, the ACE provided funding for the design portion of the project and assisted local commanders in expediting the process through the Department of Defense to Congress for the appropriation of dollars. All installations were encouraged to compete for the special assistance COTY projects provided. It required commanders to demonstrate and defend these projects as critical and necessary, by prioritizing them above the cut-line for funding at the local level. This effort on the part of the Chief of Staff of the Army, DCSENG, and the Chief of Chaplains, was a monumental step forward in helping focus attention, emphasis, and the support of commanders and Congress on the religious needs of the Army.

Currently, the Army has approximately seven hundred (700) religious facilities world-wide. Two Hundred and thirty (230) of these are World War II cantonment structures, sixty-eight (68) are temporary structures, eighty-four (84) are semi-permanent structures, and three hundred and sixteen (316) are permanent structures. The various classifications reflect the type of construction and indicate what was intended to be the "life" of the facility. Cantonment facilities were intended to be replaced

or closed in five (5) years, temporary facilities ten (10) years, semi-permanent facilities fifteen (15) years, and permanent facilities thirty to fifty (30-50) years. At the present time, over half of the Army's religious facilities are not permanent structures, and over 250 religious facilities are over fifty (50) years old. Providing religious facilities in support of the religious mission continues to be a matter of great concern for the chaplaincy, commanders, and the Army at large.⁹

CHAPLAINS' NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS

In addition to appropriated fund resourcing and religious facilities, the Army has a nonappropriated fund instrumentality called the Chaplains' Nonappropriated Fund (NAF). Approximately one hundred and thirty (130) of these unique funds have been established throughout the Army, under the supervision of local commanders. Each fund is required to be operated in accordance with Army Regulation 165-1, Chapter 16, and each fund is administered by a local, autonomous, "representative" fund council.¹⁰ A review of the Annual Report from each of the Chaplains' Funds throughout the Army indicates that there is increased abuse and misuse of these funds in purchasing services, equipment, supplies, and contracts that should be funded with appropriated dollars.¹¹ (These abuses most often occur during times of tight budgets and when local appropriated funds are limited or difficult to obtain.) Too many chaplains, commanders, and fund councils have forgotten, or they have not clearly

understood, or they have chosen to ignore the purpose for which Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds were established. This prompted the following "Policy Guidance" to commanders and chaplains Army-wide, dated 9 October 1991, from Chaplain (Major General) Matthew A. Zimmerman, Chief of Army Chaplains:

MEMORANDUM TO: ALL COMMANDERS AND CHAPLAINS

SUBJECT: Resourcing the Army's Religious Program and Free Exercise of Religion for Soldiers and Family Members

1. References:

- a. Title 10, United States Code Section 3547 (10 USC 3547).
- b. AR 165-1, Chaplain Activities in the United States Army, paragraph 1-4f, 2-2a, 4-3b, and 15-2a.

2. During these times of constrained resources commanders and chaplains at all levels are being challenged regarding the character, purpose and proper resourcing of the Army's requirement to ensure the "free exercise of religion" for soldiers and their family members. Accordingly, the following policy guidance is issued:

- a. Congress is charged by public law with the responsibility to support and resource the Chaplaincy. In fulfilling this responsibility, Congress appropriates funds to pay chaplains and assistants, provide chapel facilities and vehicles and meet costs associated with a viable religious program for soldiers and family members.
- b. Commanders and chaplains are to provide appropriated resource support for the following basic elements of the religious program:

- 1) Conduct of worship services
- 2) Conduct of religious/patriotic ceremonies
- 3) Pastoral care and counseling
- 4) Religious education and training

5) Sacraments and ministrations (this would also include those ordinances and services required by a chaplain's distinctive faith group)

6) Accommodation of religious beliefs and practices distinctive faith groups

3. The basic elements of the religious program include as a MINIMUM, facilities (conducive to worship), worship leaders and other service leaders, bulletins, music (organist/pianist, choir director/chorister), elements for sacraments and ministration such as communion supplies, chapel furnishings (supplies and equipment), contracts for religious resource personnel, and religious education to include directors of religious education, supplies and curricula.

4. The primary source of appropriated funding for commanders' religious programs is OMA Base Operations Funds (.NE Account). In addition to this funding, Mission money should be provided. The following question should be asked in determining what source of funding is proper, "Is this program or service provided to benefit a particular unit (unit mission money), or is the program or service intended to support the broader installation religious requirements (BASOPS money)?"

5. In support of the free exercise rights of soldiers and family members, Chaplain Nonappropriated Funds have been established to receive and account for soldiers and family members tithes and offerings. These contributions are remitted consistent with the individual's tenets of faith as part of the worship experience. They are distinct in character and unique in purpose and are voluntarily given by the military community to meet the spiritual, moral and related social needs of the community which CANNOT be provided from appropriated funds. THEY ARE NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE PROPER ALLOCATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS, or to "make up the difference" when appropriated funds are constrained. The following policy guidance governs Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds Army-wide.

a. Significant, even sacrificial giving by military members through chapel offerings does not relieve the Government of its mandated responsibility to provide appropriated fund support to the religious program of the command. Such giving provides the opportunity for the community to reach out beyond itself to spiritually and materially needy soldiers, family members and others worthy of spiritual and humanitarian assistance.

b. Some commanders and chaplains erroneously use Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds in resourcing the command religious program for items and programs that should be funded with appropriated dollars. Since Congress specifically appropriates funds to the commands for this purpose, use of Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds in lieu of appropriated dollars, subverts the intent of Congress and diverts money intended for spiritual and moral welfare for other purposes. Congress has never envisioned soldiers having to "pay to worship!" Soldiers should have the same benefits enjoyed by individuals in the civilian sector!

c. My office is currently studying proposed changes to AR 165-1, paragraph 16-1d, (6), which reads, "Monies may be used to purchase services, supplies, or items of equipment NOT available through appropriated sources." Subparagraphs (a) (b) (c) (d) will be changed in future interim guidance. We will provide clear and specific guidelines as to how Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds will be used.

d. The criteria for determining what is to be funded from Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds vs. appropriated funds is, "If we stopped receiving offerings tomorrow, what is it that we would be required to keep doing?" Whatever the "it" is should be funded with appropriated resources.

6. Chaplains are required by regulation to plan intentional ministry and identify those activities required, as a minimum, to assist commanders in the development of the Commander's Master Religious Program (CMRP). This document is to the commander and chaplain what the Training Schedule is to the S-3/G-3 and commander. With constrained resources it is not realistic and prudent to plan numerous programs that are beyond the scope of the commander's resources. Plan for and obtain appropriated resources for those required religious activities. It should be clearly understood that the primary purpose of Nonappropriated Chaplains' funds is to facilitate stewardship, not supplement or take the place of appropriated resources.

7. The Chief of Staff of the Army is supportive of the proper resourcing of our religious mission Army-wide. This office also continues to receive good funding support in carrying out its mission. Our soldiers and their families deserve the same.

8. Please insure this guidance is shared with all of your chaplains.

(Signed)
MATTHEW A. ZIMMERMAN
Chaplain (Major General), USA
Chief of Chaplains

It seems clear from this statement by the Chief of Chaplains that Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds exist to support the "free exercise of religion" for soldiers and family members. The Chaplains' Nonappropriated Fund is the only prescribed instrumentality authorized to receive, account for, and disburse "tithes and offerings" collected during the conduct of religious services on military installations. The important thing for commanders and chaplains to remember is that the opportunity to "worship through tithes and offerings" is a key tenet of faith in many religious traditions. Such offerings and contributions are "sacred" of nature, and the stewardship and accountability associated with their receipt and disbursement is unique and a significant responsibility. It has never been the purpose of Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds to promote the idea that soldiers and family members must pay to have church or to participate in religious activities while serving in the Armed Forces. Soldiers and family members should not be discriminated against in terms of being provided opportunities for spiritual development because they are in the military. They are entitled to religious support and a place to worship, just as they are

entitled to have a place to live, receive medical care, education, food and clothing. The Army must care for the whole soldier - physically, mentally, emotionally, and spiritually. After all, the soldier is the Army's greatest resource.

DBOF AND UNIT COST RESOURCING

In December 1990, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Donald Atwood, signed DMRD 971 which led to the establishment of the Defense Business Operations Fund (DBOF) on October 1, 1991. This fund is intended to operate with "financial principles that provide improved cost visibility and accountability to enhance business management and improve the decision making process....realizing significant monetary savings through better business practices."¹² The primary goal for implementing this fund is to provide a business management structure that encourages "providers" (managers and employees of Department of Defense support organizations), to provide quality products or services at the lowest cost. Under this structure, "customers" (those who need the product or service) establish requirements and are charged, through the rate structure, for the cost of services and products provided. The objective is to calculate the average unit cost of services and products based on what it actually cost to produce the output itself. Such calculations must include direct and indirect costs, general and administrative overhead to include manpower, equipment, supplies, and facilities. Once the total cost of production is determined,

it is divided by the total number of services or products produced for an average cost per unit output. This is called Unit Cost or Unit Cost resourcing. A common misunderstanding within DoD is that Unit Cost and DBOF are synonymous. "In reality, these programs are mutually exclusive: an activity can be in the DBOF without being under the Unit Cost or similarly, be under Unit Cost and not be in the DBOF. The DBOF is a revolving fund for financing various DoD businesses. Unit Cost is a management tool for monitoring costs and making resource allocations based on cost and output. Ideally, business activities will be unit costed before they move into DBOF."¹³ The following summary of benefits is helpful in understanding the proposed advantages of DBOF and Unit Cost resourcing:

- * A customer-provider relationship is developed between the customer (normally the operating forces) and the provider (the support activity). This relationship allows customers to determine the level/quantity of support they need to perform their mission. Support activities will produce goods or provide services to meet customer demand.

- * The Fund provides the customers a true picture of their support costs, thereby allowing them to make more informed decisions. The more functions that are included in the Fund, the closer DoD moves to mission budgeting.

- * DoD managers are encouraged to focus on performance and cost management by increasing emphasis on business operations and deemphasizing cash management.

- * The Fund will be instrumental in providing DoD managers at all levels a supportive financial system that produces useful and timely financial management information.

- * The customer, the most appropriate organization to determine requirements, justifies support funding.

- * Stabilizing prices to customers through the fund helps ensure that approved programs are executed as planned.

* Overall accounting work load is lessened, without reducing visibility of costs, due to lessening of fiscal (cash) transfers internal to the Fund. Procedures are being developed to allow the recognition and recording of revenue and expenses by each business area in the Fund for certain types of reciprocal interchanges, without the exchange of cash or recording of obligations. Intrafund transactions will be utilized instead of the more expensive and time consuming expenditure transactions reconciliation processes used today.

* Capital budgeting provides visibility of the true total cost of an operation and allows both the customer and review organizations (i.e., the Services, OSD and Congress) to make more informed decisions. It also provides a mechanism to determine whether the expected benefits of the decision are realized. Total cost management helps production managers weigh investment needs to achieve optimum results for the resources expended. The manager can determine whether investment will help achieve long-term lower costs and provide more incentive to make that investment.

* Minimal new procedures are required to implement the newly established Defense Business Operations Fund because DoD has been in the revolving fund business since 1951. There are existing cost accounting systems, which when modified to accept the new requirements and controls, will continue to serve local managers in a more efficient and expanded capacity.

* By linking support activity funding to customer requirements, rather than prior year expenditures, we will change many managers' previous mind-set of spending every dollar available to them this year for fear that they may not get as much next year.

* The expanded cost visibility increases all managers' accountability for their decisions. Customers will provide justification as to why programs are required; the Fund activities will provide information on their efficiency and effectiveness.

* The ability of Congress to influence or exercise oversight will be improved through the separation of the customers and the suppliers. Congress will receive better information about the nature and the cost of the DoD activities under review. Financial statements will provide operations and investment cost information that will not only show how much is being spent to perform support missions, but also how efficiently the missions are being performed.

* Savings resulting from better business practices that are encouraged by the Fund will reduce expenditures, maintain levels of readiness and service, and absorb staff reductions

driven by increasingly constrained budgets. Every dollar saved in the support establishment, while still providing the same quality level of support, means another dollar overall available to meet national security requirements within the reduced funding levels of DoD.¹⁴

GENERAL CONCERNS ABOUT DBOF AND UNIT COST RESOURCING:

There is little question that DBOF and Unit Cost resourcing represents a structural change of monumental proportions. But the proposed changes will not come easy. While it is the long-range goal of OSD "to move all of the support establishment into DBOF,"¹⁵ there is significant concern over the speed of implementation and the lack of special accounting systems, policy and regulations to make the system work. For example, the General Accounting Office (GAO) testified to the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) that "Defense does not have the policies, procedures, and systems in place to implement and operate the Fund in a 'business-like' manner."¹⁶ Others have expressed concern that "the introduction of a market system between operators and support personnel threatens the basic values underlying officership."¹⁷ Still others suggest that, "It is logical to assume that the DBOF will magnify careerist tendencies amongst support officers who find themselves in a 'business' operation selling support to the services....As OSD moves activities from service control into a defense agency, support officers may find their loyalties lie closer to their specialty rather than to the larger profession of arms."¹⁸

**DBOF: UPSIDE AND DOWNSIDE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CHAPLAINCY AND
THE ARMY'S RELIGIOUS MISSION**

There are significant concerns and problems that are inherent in resourcing the entire religious mission of the Army under DBOF. In a very real sense, DBOF and Unit Cost resourcing may be more threatening to the quality and viability of religious support than any resourcing attempt to date. It is critical for decision makers to consider the potential negative impact as well as the positive impact of DBOF on the religious mission of the Army. It is dangerous to assume that every Base Service Support activity should be unit costed in order to fit into this accounting system. Some of the issues and concerns regarding the religious mission that need to be dealt with are:

DOWNSIDE CONSIDERATIONS:

-- It is not reasonable nor is it appropriate to assume that you can "unit cost" or quantify every service provided to soldiers, their families, and units. This seems to be understood when it comes to making any attempt to "commodify" or unit cost what a commander or the S-3/G-3 produces. The same should hold true for the chaplain's mission. There are real problems when you attempt to cost morals, spirituality, values, ethics, and theology. These are not only central to the religious mission of the Army, they are considered "sacred" by many soldiers, chaplains, and religious organizations.

-- At installation level, 70% to 80% of the chaplains assigned are assigned to TOE units. The remainder can be considered TDA assets. Were it not for TOE requirements and the

unique character of military society, it may be possible to civilianize the chaplaincy. To fund the entire religious support mission of the Army as a "Base Services Support" activity, is grossly inconsistent with where chaplaincy assets and duties are primarily intended to focus (at the unit level). This should be a major concern for commanders and the chaplaincy as a branch. It gives the appearance that chaplains are "BASOPS assets," instead of mission essential in the TOE Army. Such a perception can undermine an essential commitment on the part of unit commanders to ensure the "free exercise" rights of every soldier in the unit during training, field duty, deployment, and combat. In reality, services provided by the unit chaplain while in the field should be resourced by the unit commander using mission dollars. This would appropriately include funding for communion supplies, literature, and other "essential elements" of worship during unit deployments when soldiers are away from garrison. These requirements should be part of the Commander's Master Religious Program (CMRP), which is as essential to the unit, the chaplain and commander, as the Training Schedule is to the unit, S-3 and commander."

-- There are programs and activities which support the commander's religious program that are more appropriately conducted and funded at garrison level. These programs and activities may include, but are not limited to, regular Sunday Worship Services for soldiers and family members, religious education (Sunday School classes for soldiers and family

members), Family Life Centers and activities, marriage enrichment seminars, spouse abuse and child abuse classes, stress management workshops for spouses and youth, youth religious programs and activities, to name only a few. On the other hand, activities supported by the commander and sponsored by the chaplain that are mission related in garrison or while deployed should be funded with mission dollars. These may include programs such as pre-deployment training for soldiers and spouses, leadership development, ethics training, soldier spiritual fitness, worship services and religious activities in the field and combat.

-- Any effort on the part of DBOF to reduce ministry and religion to a "product" or "commodity" in order to cost it to the "customer" is not in the best interest of religion, the soldier, the chaplaincy, or the Army. It poses a serious dilemma and problem for religious organizations and faith groups that support their church membership and clergy serving in the military. How can you "commodify" and cost sacraments, ordinances, religious beliefs/practices/and values in the pluralistic environment of the military without inviting problems of discrimination and issues around the "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution? It is important to note that much of what a chaplain does in the performance of his/her duties is inherent in his/her ordination and central to the ministry and ministrations that "God has called them to provide." To attempt to reduce such ministry and ministrations to a commodity is

offensive and inappropriate within the context of most religious practices and services.

-- DBOF places the Installation Chaplain in the position of being a "provider" and commanders become "customers." This relationship poses potential for conflict and concern. While at the present time the religious mission in the Army has been determined to be a "mandatory service" versus a "discretionary service" (for the next two years 1993-1995), there is no guarantee that it will remain mandatory.²⁰ Even so, the LEVEL of funding support remains somewhat discretionary for the commander, since it is his/her responsibility to determine how limited funding will be disbursed in support of varied mission requirements. This raises some interesting questions. What if the commander is paying for Sunday School, and he/she doesn't like the curriculum or instruction that is being provided? If a commander is unhappy with the chaplain assigned to his/her unit, and he/she would prefer the services of another chaplain or the pastor of the church he/she attends off-post...what then? What if a pastor off-post offers to provide religious services, programs, activities and coverage for less money than is being charged on post...what happens? If a pastor, priest, or rabbi off-post offers to provide services, religious education, youth ministry or other services at no charge, as part of their church's "outreach," can the commander embrace this option?

-- There are over one hundred and forty-two (142) distinctive faith groups represented in the Army Chaplaincy.²¹

Each faith group has a distinctive theology and doctrines, and many have distinctive traditions in worship. How do you cost the value of a worship service in the military's "pluralistic environment?" For example, a priest may be able to perform the Catholic Mass in 15 to 20 minutes. On the other hand, a Full-Gospel preacher may require a two hour service complete with choirs, gospel instrumental band, ordinances and sacraments that satisfy his worship tradition. Do you cost both services the same? If not, how do you "value" their difference, and what does that suggest to the various distinctive faith groups? If the cost is based on the "elements" of one service over another, the matter of religious discrimination based upon tradition could be raised. If you base costs upon an element of "time," there remains a potential conflict with religious tradition, plus the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) does not allow the nonpersonal service contract to be based on what may appear to be an hourly wage or salary if you have to contract the service. How much do you charge for baptism by "immersion," versus baptism by "sprinkling?" Obviously, the water resource for immersion cost more than a lesser amount of water used in sprinkling. The question that can be raised here is, "Is one form 'worth' more than the other in the lives of those performing and receiving the ordinance?" What about hospital visitations, blessings, memorial services, suicide counseling, crisis intervention, field visits and other pastoral ministrations? These and many more issues are

matters of great concern in providing for the "free exercise of religion."

-- As stated above, DBOF may open the door to civilianization of the chaplaincy. This strikes at the very heart of "free exercise" issues in the military, and it invites "establishment of religion" conflicts. In reality, these considerations significantly compromise the importance and purpose of the chaplaincy.

-- In recent years the Army has found it necessary to contract the services of clergy who represent critically short faith groups in the Army. This has primarily been necessary to provide religious coverage to Catholic soldiers and family members, since the Army has less than 40% of the number of Catholic Chaplains it requires to meet the Army's need. The contract instrument used to contract Catholic Priests is the Nonpersonal Services contract. What happens if an Installation Commander determines it is necessary to contract a civilian priest to provide Catholic Masses? Consistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation, he/she determines to advertise for the services required. For the purposes of illustration, assume two individuals go through the proper process of submitting a bid. One individual is a Priest from the local Diocese who has pastored for five years. The other individual is a former Priest, now married and he served as a Catholic Chaplain in the Army for 28 years and retired as a Colonel. Both individuals have demonstrated that they can perform and provide the service

the Army needs. The retired Chaplain submits a bid which is lower than the bid submitted by the Priest. Who gets the contract? The Catholic Church does not consider the "married priest" to have authority to function as a priest any longer. Can the commander, as a representative of the government, favor one individual over the other based on what a religious body "recognizes as Priesthood authority?" Remember the retired Catholic Chaplain demonstrated his ability to perform the services desired for 28 years in the Army. Is this a potential case of discrimination or a possible challenge to the "establishment" clause? How will the Army prepare commanders to make these kinds of decisions in a world where religious groups, organizations and individuals often "contend" with one another? Again, the Army Chaplaincy is extremely unusual in it's ability to work together in the "pluralistic religious environment" of the military.

UPSIDE CONSIDERATIONS:

While there are many elements in the religious mission of the Army that do not properly "fit" into DBOF and Unit Cost resourcing, there are some that do fit very well. Examples of these elements are:

- maintenance
- supplies
- construction
- repairs

-- equipment

-- grounds and facilities

These support services are distinctive from ministry and ministration elements. It is important not to consider them in the same light when it comes to resourcing.

SUMMARY:

For many individuals spiritual fitness is a daily activity and pursuit. For others, religious values are relied upon more totally during times of personal struggle, death, loss of job, deployment, illness, demanding training, divorce, combat. If the commander does not personally or professionally see the value of funding the religious mission in his/her unit, resourcing the religious mission under DBOF is a real concern, especially if it is ever determined that the religious mission is "discretionary." As of today, there are absolutely no guarantees that this won't happen sometime after 1995 when "mandatory" services are to be re-evaluated. Commanders should not be placed in the position of having to weigh the value of "free exercise of religion" against other requirements? Simply stated, DBOF currently raises more unsettling questions and concerns when it comes to the religious mission of the Army, than it provides answers or acceptable solutions.

**RESOURCING ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF RELIGION TO ENSURE THE
"FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION"**

MAJOR FAITH GROUPS VERSUS DISTINCTIVE FAITH GROUPS:

Resources and funding are at the center of virtually all issues facing our country and Army today. There simply are not enough dollars available to satisfy ever increasing needs of the private sector, the military, and the government's domestic and international responsibilities. As a result, careful and responsible management of limited resources is an imperative for everyone. In this regard, the chaplaincy must look at appropriate and responsible ways to improve efficiency and effectiveness in carrying out the religious mission of the Army in this new and changing environment.

Since the Katcoff v. Marsh case, which challenged the "constitutionality of the Army chaplaincy program under the First Amendment," the Army chaplaincy has had to reconsider many of it's views and some of it's practices that continue to have potential impact on "establishment of religion" and "free exercise of religion" issues. Prior to Katcoff v. Marsh, the Army resourced it's religious mission based on a concept that there were four "Major Faith Groups" (Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, and Jewish). This orientation was open to challenge and it was determined to be potentially discriminatory. It suggested that if a denomination was not one of the four labeled "Major Faith Groups" it must be a "Minor Faith Group." (This gave the appearance of "first class" and "second class" groups.)

In practice, Catholic, Jewish, and Orthodox programs in the Army were given funding for their distinctive activities, while all other faith groups were lumped under the "Protestant" umbrella. Within the "Protestant" group, only the "General Protestant" or "Collective Protestant" programs and activities were resourced with appropriated funds. Denominational military congregations meeting on the installation such as the Lutherans, Seventh-Day Adventist, Episcopalians, and Church of God (to name a few), were not resourced nor were they given fair and equitable consideration in scheduling facilities. In most instances, these groups were required to pay for their own music, religious education, sacramental supplies and equipment, and so forth, while the denominational Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and General Protestant programs were provided appropriated funding. This practice was more the result of a traditional way of resourcing the religious mission of the military, than it was an intentional effort to be discriminatory. Nevertheless, the practice did discriminate and there was a need for change in order to "fairly and equitably" meet the "free exercise" needs of soldiers without being victimized by potential "establishment of religion" conflicts. The concern remains that the government not be placed in a position where it appears that it is giving preferential treatment to one religious group over another.

Today, the Army considers each denominational group as a "distinctive faith group." This terminology is now part of the Army's regulatory guidance.²² In addition, the Army Chief of

Chaplain has provided "Policies and Guidelines" to the field which direct "fair and equitable" distribution of resources in support of all religious programs meeting on Army installations.²³

THE NEED TO PROVIDE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF RELIGION:

At the present time, there are approximately eighty to ninety denominational endorsing agencies recognized by the Armed Forces Chaplains Board. These endorsers represent one hundred and forty-two (142) "distinctive faith groups" that have chaplains serving in the Army. The number of faith groups represented by soldiers in the military is much, much higher. Obviously, it is impossible for the Army to resource all of the distinctive requirements of each faith group. There simply are not enough resources available. Therefore, the Army has had to look at "fair and equitable" distribution of its limited resources in a way that meets the basic, essential requirements of various religious traditions. Examples of this are as follows:

-- Since the Army does not have the resources to contract clergy from every soldier's religious tradition, chaplains are commissioned to serve in the military's "pluralistic environment." They are required to conduct services and provide worship opportunity for soldiers of all faiths. Chaplains must meet the requirements of their denominations and the Department of Defense for professional training, ordination, and commissioning as military officers.

-- Various denominations have distinctive requirements for worship facilities, furnishings, equipment, and supplies. The Army's standardized construction designs for religious facilities have taken these requirements into consideration in providing worship facilities and an environment that can be configured to meet as many of these needs as possible. Christian, Jewish, Moslem and Islamic services are currently being held in military religious facilities throughout the Army.

-- Distinctive faith groups also have distinctive worship services. Some denominations hold services in which music plays an important role, other groups are "non-instrumental," and some have no music at all. It is unrealistic for the Army to provide each tradition their own distinctive hymnal, and so an Armed Forces Hymnal has been compiled with music from various traditions consolidated into a single volume with Orders of Worship and Responsive Readings.

-- The military makes scriptures and religious literature available to Christians, Jews, and others.

-- In recent years the Armed Forces Chaplain's Board has recommended a "unified religious curriculum" for Christian Religious Education Programs at installation and unit level. This was done because it was impossible to purchase curriculum prepared by each denomination.

-- Sensitivity to distinctive faith requirements related to sacraments and ordinances has also been a consideration in

providing common elements for sacraments, ecclesiastical supplies, equipment, and furnishings.

Even with these efforts, demands on resources outstrip availability of resources. Some things are "essential/required" and some things are "nice to have." While commanders are responsible to resource the religious mission of the Army, they cannot be expected to fund everything. For this reason, the Chief of Army Chaplains has determined that the Army must fund, as a minimum, the "essential (basic) elements of religion" shared in common by groups of a similar religious tradition. For example, communion is a sacrament and practice that is essential and required in the Christian tradition. It is required, therefore, for communion elements or supplies to be purchased with appropriated dollars in support of "free exercise." On the other hand, should a distinctive faith group not find the Armed Forces Hymnal as "desirable" as a hymnal from their own tradition, the commander should not be REQUIRED to use appropriated resources to fund this "preference" when funds are not available.

The concept of "essential (basic) elements of religion" is relatively new to the Army. A specific definition of what it means is found in the Introduction to Chapter 14 of DRAFT Revision to Army Regulation 165-1, dated 26 May 1992. It reads as follows:

... The essential elements of religion are those concepts, functions, practices, and objects that are commonly held by distinctive faiths as essential for spiritual values and include, but are not limited to the

following: worship, communion, music, baptism (initiation rites), fellowship and religious education, pastoral support. Appropriated funding will be used to provide those services, facilities, furnishings, ecclesiastical equipment, and supplies that enable the essential elements of religion to be fulfilled/met.

In an effort to verify that these elements are required, this study distributed a survey to Ecclesiastical Endorsing Agents recognized by the Armed Forces Chaplains Board. These Endorsing Agents represent 142 distinctive faith groups, the majority of which have chaplains serving in the military. Endorsing Agents that responded to the survey included representatives from Christian, Jewish, and Buddhist traditions. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the surveys distributed were returned with the following results:

- Worship facility (dedicated or specifically designated for the conduct of religious services such as a military chapel)
 - 51% ESSENTIAL (Absolutely Required)
 - 43% OPTIONAL (Not Required/Nice to Have)
 - 4% NEUTRAL (Neither Required nor Forbidden)
 - 2% DISCOURAGED
 - 0% FORBIDDEN
- Facility available for worship (normally used for other activities such as a gymnasium, movie theater, Officer or Enlisted Club, school)
 - 23% ESSENTIAL
 - 43% OPTIONAL
 - 10% NEUTRAL
 - 16% DISCOURAGED
 - 8% FORBIDDEN
- Scriptures
 - 98% ESSENTIAL
 - 2% OPTIONAL
- Tithes and Offerings
 - 57% ESSENTIAL
 - 31% OPTIONAL
 - 12% NEUTRAL

- Music
 - 61% ESSENTIAL
 - 35% OPTIONAL
 - 4% NEUTRAL
- Sacraments
 - 67% ESSENTIAL
 - 12% OPTIONAL
 - 10% NEUTRAL
 - 4% DISCOURAGED
 - 7% FORBIDDEN
- Ordinances
 - 67% ESSENTIAL
 - 23% OPTIONAL
 - 10% NEUTRAL
- Marriages
 - 71% ESSENTIAL
 - 22% OPTIONAL
 - 7% NEUTRAL
- Sunday School Classes
 - 63% ESSENTIAL
 - 31% OPTIONAL
 - 6% NEUTRAL
- Confirmation Classes
 - 39% ESSENTIAL
 - 27% OPTIONAL
 - 16% NEUTRAL
 - 10% DISCOURAGED
 - 8% FORBIDDEN
- Pastoral counseling
 - 73% ESSENTIAL
 - 25% OPTIONAL
 - 2% NEUTRAL
- Pastoral visitations to hospital
 - 84% ESSENTIAL
 - 14% OPTIONAL
 - 2% NEUTRAL
- Pastoral visitations to prison/confinement
 - 80% ESSENTIAL
 - 18% OPTIONAL
 - 2% NEUTRAL

-- Pastoral visitation to homes

- 55% ESSENTIAL
- 37% OPTIONAL
- 6% NEUTRAL
- 2% DISCOURAGED

-- Pastoral visitations to work-place, field, combat

- 90% ESSENTIAL
- 4% OPTIONAL
- 2% NEUTRAL
- 2% DISCOURAGED
- 2% FORBIDDEN

-- Other Essential Elements not listed or comments:

- * Funerals and Memorials, small group Bible Studies, Fellowship Services, Healing, Chanting, Preaching, Prayers, Interpreting Scripture

The survey verified the "essential elements of religion" as defined in DRAFT Revision to Army Regulation 165-1, Chapter 14, "Introduction." This information can assist commanders and chaplains in determining what must be funded with appropriated dollars in support of "free exercise of religion." It specifically defines what the "essential elements of religion" are in answer to the question Chaplain (Major General) Zimmerman asked in paragraph (5d) of his Policy Guidance dated 9 October 1991. The question he asked was, "If we stopped receiving offerings tomorrow, what would it be that we are required to keep doing?" The "essential elements of religion" are the things that "we would be required to keep doing." They fall into the following categories: **Worship Facilities; Scriptures; Giving of Tithes and Offerings; Music; Sacraments, Ordinances, Marriages; Religious Education; Pastoral Care.** These requirements AS A MINIMUM, "should be funded with appropriated resources."

(Appendix I)

FUNDING NON-ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF RELIGION USING APF AND NAF:

It is understood that not every aspect of religious expression is required or essential to an individual's faith commitment and spiritual life. However, this is not to say that "non-essential elements" are without importance and value. The distinction between "essential" and "non-essential," for the purpose of this study, has merit only in terms of determining how best to prioritize resourcing the Army's religious mission. It is critical to remember that a funding priority for "essential elements of religion" represents the commander's MINIMUM requirement for religious support. It is the start point. Appropriated resources may also be used to fund many "non-essential" elements of religion.

What if appropriated funds are not available for some of the non-essential elements of religion? What does the commander and chaplain do to fund these important elements? The unique character of Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds has already been addressed, but appropriate utilization of these funds in support of the religious mission needs further clarification. As noted, these funds represent voluntary giving on the part of the military community as an integral part of worship and has historical precedence in religious practice. Their primary purpose is to facilitate stewardship on the part of soldiers and their family members.²⁴ They are intended to "support and promote the moral, spiritual, and ethical climate of the Army by enhancing the Army's religious program."²⁵ Therefore, it is

appropriate to use Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds for the following:

-- Non-essential elements of religion for Distinctive faith groups which include BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO: denominational hymnals or special music, denominational religious education materials in lieu of the unified curriculum, special supplies, and religious support personnel. (Basically, anything a distinctive faith group "desires" versus "requires" beyond the scope of what appropriated funds can provide.)

-- Funding for parish suppers, fellowship activities, outreach programs in the community, recreational or retreat fees for soldiers and family members.

-- Resources for family member programs and activities to include Youth of the Chapel, Women of the Chapel, Men of the Chapel Auxiliaries.

-- MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL...Designated Offerings in support of religious activities related to the military community and religious activities that enhance military-civilian relations. Included are missionary, benevolent, and philanthropic projects similar to those supported by civilian churches, synagogues, and temples.²⁶

SUMMARY:

It is absolutely critical for commanders and chaplains to understand the intended purpose of appropriated and nonappropriated resources in support of the religious mission. A review of annual reports from each Chaplains' Nonappropriated

Fund Army-wide, and an evaluation of the level of appropriated funding in support of the religious mission by MACOM and installation Army-wide, documents the immediate need for correcting and improving resource practices in support of the religious mission of the Army.

**COMMANDER'S MASTER RELIGIOUS PROGRAM: THE KEY TO
EFFICIENCY IN RESOURCING**

By regulation, chaplains are required to prepare a Commander's Master Religious Program (CMRP) annually for the commander. The purpose of this document is to incorporate the Army, MACOM, commander's, and Chief of Chaplains' Goals and Objectives, and to ensure that soldiers are provided maximum opportunity for free exercise of religion. The CMRP is to be the working document for resourcing religious and training activities for the community, installation, and unit.⁷

DEVELOPING THE CMRP:

In order to have value as a resource tool, this CMRP is developed from the unit level up to installation. The unit chaplain sits with the S-3 Operations Officer to determine projected operational and mission requirements for the next year. The chaplain looks at training cycles, schedules for ranges, time in the field, deployments, time in garrison, and any special missions that are projected. This information is used to develop a plan for religious coverage. Consideration is given to requirements for worship services, religious holy days and observances, distinctive faith requirements for soldiers and

family members, recommendations for pre-deployment classes for spouses, character-guidance and leadership development classes for soldiers, worship services and supplies needed in the field, unit prayer breakfasts, spiritual fitness training, and other programs and activities involving soldiers and families in the unit. Coordination is done with the unit S-3, Brigade Chaplain, and Installation Chaplain for proposed scheduling of activities through the year, and recommendations are included on how the commander should resource the plan. For example, all programs and activities that can be provided more effectively at installation level such as Sunday School, spouse abuse and parenting classes would be recommended for appropriated funding at installation level. Pre-deployment training, communion services in the field, and literature for spiritual fitness classes would be recommended for funding at unit level with mission dollars. Finally, Chaplains Nonappropriated Funds may be requested in support of soldier and family retreats.

Once the unit commander accepts the proposed plan, he/she "signs-off" on it, showing his/her commitment and support. At this point it becomes the Commander's Master Religious PROGRAM. It is then forwarded through channels for approval for additional resourcing as appropriate. The CMRP demonstrates a commitment to intentional ministry on the part of the chaplain, and a clear understanding on the part of the commander and chaplain of how the religious mission will be resourced and carried out. The result should be increased efficiency and effectiveness in

providing a viable religious program for soldiers and family members.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The need to insure proper resourcing of the religious mission of the United States Army in the future, is one of the significant issues facing commanders and chaplains today. Unit cost resourcing and the Defense Business Operations Fund promise to profoundly impact the defense support infrastructure and current modes of resource management. However, the actual effect it can have on support activities like the chaplaincy and the Army's religious mission depends on the specific policies, regulations, and rules imposed by OSD and the procedures selected by the Army for final implementation. What is needed is a careful evaluation of what services should or should not be included in the DBOF and Unit Cost resourcing.

In as much as the Defense Operations Fund and Unit Cost resourcing is still in the early stages of development and implementation, it is imperative that the Office of the Chief of Chaplains become highly visible and a key participant in the process of determining if the entire religious support mission should be included in the DBOF and Unit Cost resourcing. It is the opinion of the writer of this paper that inclusion of the entire religious mission would be highly detrimental to the spiritual well-being of soldiers, family members unless the religious mission is guaranteed by regulation to be a "mandatory"

service. Any attempt to quantify religious support or to reduce spiritual values, morals, and services provided by a chaplain to a commodity is unacceptable and a step in the wrong direction. Only the maintenance, supplies, repairs, construction, equipment, grounds and facilities elements of the religious mission should be considered for Unit Cost resourcing in the Defense Business Operations Fund. All other religious support programs, activities, sacraments and ordinances should be considered ministry and ministrations and should be resourced as a single entity in DBOF or through a special MDEP managed by the Chief of Chaplains, through MACOMS, to installation level. Commanders and chaplains have a solemn duty to ensure "the free exercise of religion" for all members of the military by providing proper resourcing at appropriate levels. It is absolutely imperative that all essential elements of religion be resourced using: 1) appropriated funds from a Chief of Chaplains' Religious Mission MDEP; 2) DBOF funding at installation level; and, 3) mission dollars at unit level. Supplemental resourcing for non-essential elements of religion may be resourced using Chaplains' Nonappropriated Funds when appropriated funds are not available.

Finally, religion and the role of the chaplain in providing for the "spiritual fitness" of soldiers, units, and installations are integral to good discipline, operations, and the mission of the Army. Commanders and chaplains at all levels must refocus on the need to keep the religious mission viable during these times of constrained and limited resources. Spiritual readiness like

mission readiness cannot be infused into the life of a soldier or
the disposition of the Army the minute "the balloon goes up!"

PAGE 40 IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX I

**SURVEY OF "ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS
OF RELIGION"**

PURPOSE:

Military budgets are becoming smaller and resources are more limited. It is imperative that the "essential elements of religion" be identified to assist the Army in providing the required level of support necessary to ensure the right of "free exercise of religion" for soldiers and their family members.

This survey is being disseminated to the Ecclesiastical Endorsing Agents/Representatives of the various denominations and faith groups that have "members" serving in the Armed Forces.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please follow the directions carefully.

- * Use a #2 lead pencil and the answer sheet provided to record your response to each question.
 - * Write the NAME of your Faith Group/Organization /Denomination in the blank area on the side of the answer sheet.
 - ** Please answer each question and darken the number, 1 through 5, that most closely represents the degree to which your faith group's doctrines and/or traditions require the following as "essential elements of religion" in meeting the spiritual needs of church "members."
- | | | |
|-----|-------------|----------------------------------|
| (1) | ESSENTIAL | (Absolutely Required) |
| (2) | OPTIONAL | (Not Required/Nice to Have) |
| (3) | NEUTRAL | (Neither Required nor Forbidden) |
| (4) | DISCOURAGED | (Not Desirable) |
| (5) | FORBIDDEN | |

SURVEY

REQUIREMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PUBLIC WORSHIP:

1. Worship facility (dedicated or specifically designated for the conduct of religious services such as a military chapel)
2. Facility available for worship (normally used for other activities such as a gymnasium, movie theater, Officer or Enlisted Club, school)
3. Scriptures

4. Tithes and Offerings

5. Music

SACRAMENTS, ORDINANCES, SERVICES, MINISTRATIONS:

6. Sacraments

7. Ordinances

8. Scriptures

9. Marriages

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION:

10. Sunday School Classes

11. Confirmation Classes

PASTORAL CARE:

12. Pastoral Counseling

13. Pastoral visitations to hospital

14. Pastoral visitations to prison/confinement

15. Pastoral visitations to homes

16. Pastoral visitations to work-place, field, combat

OTHER ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS NOT LISTED or COMMENTS:

ENDNOTES

¹ Department of the Army. Chaplain Activities in the United States Army, Army Regulation 165-1 (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 31 August 1989), 5.

² Ibid.

³ U.S. Laws. United States Code, 1982 ed. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1982.) Vol. 3, Title 10, Section 3547.

⁴ Parker C. Thompson, ed., The United States Army Chaplaincy, (Washington: Vol. 1, 1978), xix.

⁵ U.S. Army War College, "Army Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System." Army Command, Leadership, Management: Theory and Practice A Reference Text (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: 1992-1993), 14-9.

⁶ Chaplain (Colonel) Timothy Tatum, Director, Information Resources Management and Logistics, Office of the Chief of Army Chaplains, Pentagon, Washington, DC. Interview by author, 3 December 1992.

⁷ Army Regulation 165-1, 29.

⁸ Chaplain (LTC) Gary R. Counsell, Deputy Director Logistics and Construction, Office of the Chief of Army Chaplains, 1987-1991. Interview by author, 21 January 1993, Fort Carson, Colorado, telephone.

⁹ Ibid., interview by author, 4 February 1993, Fort Carson, Colorado, telephone.

¹⁰ Army Regulation 165-1, 32.

¹¹ Chaplain (LTC) Donald G. Hanchett, author, personal knowledge gleaned from review of Chaplains' Nonappropriated Fund Annual Reports while serving as the Deputy Director, Resources Management, Office of the Army Chief of Chaplains, Washington, DC, 1989-1992.

¹² Defense Business Operations Fund Implementation Plan, (March 1, 1992) 1.

¹³ LTC Kent D. Miller, Jr., "Unit Costing Outside DBOF," Resource Management, PB 48-92-1, (May 1992): 12.

¹⁴ Ibid., Defense Business Operations Fund Implementation Plan, 48-49.

¹⁵ MAJ Paul G. Hough, USAF, "Financial Management For The New World Order," Airpower Journal, Vol. VI, No. 3 (Fall 1992): 44.

¹⁶ Ibid., 48.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Army Regulation 165-1, 6.

²⁰ John R. Kohler, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management), interview by author, 26 January 1993, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

²¹ The number of 142 distinctive faith groups being represented in the Army Chaplaincy was referenced in the January 1993 Logistics, Information and Finance Training, in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

²² Army Regulation 165-1, 6.

²³ Chaplain (COL) James A. Edgren, Director, Information, Resources Management and Logistics, Office of the Chief of Army Chaplains, "Policy Guidance on Funding for Denominational Activities," for all chaplains and commanders Army-wide, 1 January 1988.

²⁴ Army Regulation 165-1, 34.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid., 6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Army BASCPS Primer (March 1992).
- Defense Business Operations Fund Implementation Plan
(March 1, 1992).
- Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1993 Calendar No. 677,
Report 102-408 (17 September 1992).
- Department of Defense: Directive "Accommodation of Religious
Practices Within the Military Services." No. 1300.17
(3 February 1988).
- Financial Management: Status of the Defense Business Operations
Fund GAO/AFMD-92-79 (June 1992).
- Freitag, Merle, Lieutenant General, USA, "A Message From the
Comptroller of the Army..." Resource Management PB 48-92-1
(May 1992).
- Glandon, David E., "The Problem: Building Down? or
Rightsizing." Resource Management PB 48-92-1 (May 1992).
- Hough, Paul G., MAJ, USAF, "Financial Management for the New
World Order." Airpower Journal Vol. VI, No. 3 (Fall 1992).
- Huffman, Margie, "Defense Business Operations Fund: The
Ultimate Goal." Resource Management PB 48-92-1
(May 1992).
- Hyek, Irene A. MAJ, USA, Appropriated Funds Financial Handbook
for Chaplains. U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School
(Fort Monmouth, NJ: February 1984).
- Jones, L.R., "Minding the Pentagon's Business." Government
Executive (October 1992).
- _____. "The Pentagon Squeeze." Government Executive
(February 1992).
- Katcoff v. Marsh, United States Court of Appeals, Second
Circuit. No. 352, Docket 84-6184. Argued 29 October
1984, Decided 22 January 1985.
- Kohler, John R., "New Directions in Financial Management."
Resource Management PB 49-92-1 (May 1992).

Kutter, Wolf-Dietrich, and W.E. Depuy, Jr., "Total Cost Visibility - Total Mission Budgeting." Resource Management PB 48-92-1 (May 1992).

Miller, Kent D., LTC, "Unit Costing Outside DBOF." Resource Management PB 48-92-1 (May 1992).

Thompson, Parker C., "The United States Army Chaplaincy." From Its European Antecedents to 1791 Vol. 1 (Washington: 1978).

U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School, "A Collection of OCCH Policies Concerning the Chaplains' Nonappropriated Fund: 1986 to Present." First Edition (Draft) (November 1991).

_____, "The Unit Ministry Team-General Support (Installation)." Field Circular 16-5-4 (Fort Monmouth, NJ October 1986).

U.S. Army Finance School, Executive Handbook for Financial Management (Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, October 1987).

U.S. Army War College, "Army Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System." Army Command, Leadership, and Management: Theory and Practice A Reference Text (1992-1993).

U.S. Department of the Army. Army Management Philosophy Army Regulation 5-1 (Washington: 12 June 1992).

U.S. Department of the Army. Chaplain Activities in the United States Army Army Regulation 165-1 (Washington: U.S. Department of the Army, 31 August 1989).

_____, Chaplain Activities in the United States Army DRAFT: Revision Army Regulation 165-1 (26 May 1992).

U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 16-1: Religious Support Doctrine (Washington: November 1989).

U.S. Department of the Army. Field Manual 16-5: Chaplain and Chaplain Assistant in Combat Operations (Washington: December 1984).

U.S. Department of the Army. Installation Management and Organization Army Regulation 5-3 (Washington: 9 October 1992).

U.S. Department of the Army, Pamphlet 165-13-1: Religious Requirements and Practices (Washington: April 1980).

U.S. Department of the Army, Pamphlet 600-63-4: Spiritual Fitness (Washington: September 1987).

Wakefield, Patrick J., "Unit Cost- What the Future Holds."
Resource Management PB 48-92-1 (May 1992).

NTIS does not permit return of items for credit or refund. A replacement will be provided if an error is made in filling your order, if the item was received in damaged condition, or if the item is defective.

Reproduced by NTIS
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA 22161

This report was printed specifically for your order from our collection of more than 2 million technical reports.

For economy and efficiency, NTIS does not maintain stock of its vast collection of technical reports. Rather, most documents are printed for each order. Your copy is the best possible reproduction available from our master archive. If you have any questions concerning this document or any order you placed with NTIS, please call our Customer Services Department at (703)487-4660.

Always think of NTIS when you want:

- Access to the technical, scientific, and engineering results generated by the ongoing multibillion dollar R&D program of the U.S. Government.
- R&D results from Japan, West Germany, Great Britain, and some 20 other countries, most of it reported in English.

NTIS also operates two centers that can provide you with valuable information:

- The Federal Computer Products Center - offers software and datafiles produced by Federal agencies.
- The Center for the Utilization of Federal Technology - gives you access to the best of Federal technologies and laboratory resources.

For more information about NTIS, send for our *FREE NTIS Products and Services Catalog* which describes how you can access this U.S. and foreign Government technology. Call (703)487-4650 or send this sheet to NTIS, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA 22161. Ask for catalog, PR-827.

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone _____

*- Your Source to U.S. and Foreign Government
Research and Technology.*